REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 and 10-50 are pending in this application, of which Claims 3-8, 10-12, 14-20 and 22-50 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 2, 5-8, 13 and 21 are amended, support for which is found in the original claims. Claims 1 and 9 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101; and Claims 1, 2, 9, 13 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. 2004/0021663 (Suzuki) in view of U.S. 6,590,573 (Geshwind).

Initially, Claim 2 is amended to correct the antecedent basis issue identified on page 2 of the Office Action, and Claim 21 is amended to recite statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§101 and 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Additionally, it appears the Office Action erroneously rejected Claims 1, 2, 9, 13 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §***102(b)*** as anticipated by Suzuki in view of Geshwind. Applicant assumes the Office Action intended to reject these claims under 35 U.S.C. §***103(a)*** as unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Geshwind, and this response to the Office Action is based on this assumption. Clarification as to the rejection is respectfully requested in a next Office Action.

As to the rejection in view of Suzuki and Geshwind, Claim 2 recites:

> A three-dimensional pointing method for pointing at a desired point in a three-dimensional space represented on a display apparatus based on two-dimensional coordinates of a position that is pointed at by a pen tip of an input pen on a predetermined detection plane, pen pressure that is pressure applied to the pen tip of the input pen, an inclination angle that is an angle between an axis of the input pen and the detection plane, and an direction angle that is an

> angle between a projection of the axis of the input pen onto the detection plane and a predetermined line on the detection plane, the method comprising:
>
> obtaining an extension of the axis of the input pen in the three-dimensional space ***based on the inclination angle and the direction angle of the input pen***;
>
> displaying a three-dimensional pointer on the extension of the axis of the input pen in the three-dimensional space; and
>
> ***changing a coordinate of the three-dimensional pointer*** in the direction of the extension in the three-dimensional space ***according to the pen pressure of the input pen***, and displaying the three-dimensional pointer based on the changed coordinate.
>
> [Emphasis added].

It is respectfully submitted the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the above-emphasized features of Claim 2.

Geshwind describes a mouse with a second ball which enables input on a third axis, for example, to point a screen cursor in a particular direction, and not just position the cursor on an X-Y plane or as a rotational input.[1] Geshwind also describes controlling the angle or tilt of a virtual "pen" by twisting the mouse.[2] However, Geshwind is silent regarding obtaining an extension of the axis of an input pen ***based on an inclination angle and a direction angle of the input pen***. In particular, Geshwind does not obtain either an inclination angle or a direction angle of the mouse, but rather controls the angle or tilt of the virtual "pen" based on a twisting movement of the mouse, which is based on detection of movement of the mouse,[3] rather than a detection of position of an input pen (inclination angle and direction angle) as recited in Claim 2.

Further, Geshwind acknowledges, but teaches away from, the use of an input pen, where tip pressure is measured and can be used for a third axis.[4] However, further to the above comments, Geshwind is silent regarding obtaining an inclination angle or a direction angle of the pen to obtain the extension of the axis of the pen, as recited in Claim 2.

---

[1] Geshwind, column 23, lines 16-30.
[2] Geshwind, column 25, lines 1-8.
[3] Geshwind, Fig. 3C shows the twisting action, where two balls move in opposite directions.
[4] Geshwind, column 23, lines 5-11.

Suzuki fails to remedy the above noted deficiencies of Geshwind. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted Claim 2 (and any claim depending therefrom) is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 13, although varying in scope and directed to a different statutory class, recites features which are also not described by the cited references for substantially the same reasons as noted above regarding Claim 2. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted Claim 13 (and any claim depending therefrom) is also allowable over the cited references.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Marc A. Robinson
Registration No. 59,276

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 07/09)